

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Healthcare professional perceptions of family-centred rounds in French NICUs: a cross sectional study
AUTHORS	Thébaud, Véronique; Lecorguillé, Marion; Roué, Jean-Michel; Sizun, Jacques

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Janne Weis Copenhagen University Hospital, Rigshospitalet, Department of Neonatology, Denmark
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Jul-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an interesting paper providing valuable information on current practice and perceptions of parent participation at medical rounds in French NICUs, and I recommend acceptance of the paper.</p> <p>However, I have a few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please consider the terming when referring to participants and setting as this is not consistent. Sometimes e.g. the term is French NICUs but in the discussion section you refer to French-speaking European settings.2. You might improve your manuscript by referring to parents being present in the unit or staying in the unit rather than "visits" as the latter may imply that parents are assigned a rather peripheral role in relation to the infant and participation in care decisions.3. Please be aware of the relatively new paper by Abdel-Latif et al 2015 (Parental Presence on neonatal intensive care unit clinical bedside rounds - randomised trial and focus group discussion) finding that parents did not experience more stress when participating in clinical bedside rounds. <p>It has been interesting reading the paper and I look forward to the results from your ongoing studies.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Hanne Aagaard Aarhus University Hospital Dept. of Pediatrics Denmark
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Jul-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for creating this paper which have very valuable information about HCP perception of some issues in working with newborn, premature and the families. It is very interesting that the research is framed in the 'intervention mapping theoretical approach.</p> <p>Two comments:</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>The description of the validation of the questionnaire is unclear and the paper will benefit from a more clear description of the validation-process</p> <p>The content analysis might be more accurately described and at least you have to add reference(s)</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

To reviewer 1:

1. The term "French NICUs" has been used instead of "French-speaking European settings".
2. The term "visits" has been deleted. We are using the term "parental presence" in the revised manuscript.
3. The article by Abdel-Latif et al 2015 has been discussed and added into the reference list (ref 15)

To reviewer 2:

- this sentence has been added "The pilot questionnaire was tested with the help of the Hospital Quality Improvement Office on a sample of 5 HCPs and modified for a better clarity of the question wording. "
- This sentence has been added: "Open-ended questions coding consisted first in screening similar sentences by manually colour coding. Key words from similar sentences were then grouped under a specific theme. A thematic list was obtained with corresponding key words that were then manually quantified. Whenever the same colour-code was repeated for a respondent, the colour code was counted only once. "